

Message Text

PAGE 01 VIENNA 04305 01 OF 06 231448 Z

46

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-02 INR-10

L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15 USIA-12

NEA-10 GAC-01 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 OIC-04 AEC-11 AECE-00

ACDA-19 OMB-01 RSR-01 /153 W
----- 011693

P R 231238 Z MAY 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8960

INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

ALL MBFR CAPITALS 486

USMISSION GENEVA

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

USDEL SALT TWO II

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 1 OF 6 VIENNA 4305

E. O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM

SUBJECT: MBFR: MAY 22 MEETING OF UNOFFICIAL EAST/ WEST DRAFTING
PANEL

GENEVA FOR DISTO

FROM US REP MBFR

1. SUMMAYR: SECOND MEETING OF UNOFFICIAL DRAFTING PANEL TO
PREPARE FOR PLENARIES TOOK PLACE MAY 22, WITH REPRESENTATIVES
OF FRG, NETHERLANDS, UK AND US FOR ALLIES AND OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA,
GDR, POLAND, AND USSR FROM WARSAW PACT. DISCUSSION REGISTERED
NO PROGRESS TOWARD A COMMON UNDERSTANDING ON AGENDA, AND SESSION
CONCLUDED WITH SPOKESMEN FOR BOTH SIDES INDICATING THEIR IMPRESSION
THAT DISCUSSION OF THE AGENDA APPEARED TO HAVE REACHED AN
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 04305 01 OF 06 231448 Z

IMPASSE. END SUMMARY.

2. UNOFFICIAL DRAFTING PANEL TO PREPARE FOR PLENARY DISCUSSION
OF THE AGENDA TOOK PLACE AFTERNOON OF MAY 22 AT IAEA HEAD-

QUARTERS. FRG, NETHERLANDS, UK, AND US REPS WERE PRESENT FOR THE ALLIES. CZECH REP (LAHODA), GERMAN REP (BRIE), POLISH REP (STRULAK) AND SOVIET REPS (KHLESTOV AND TIMERBAYEV) WERE PRESENT FOR THE EAST. FRG REP ACTED AS CHAIRMAN.

3. NETHERLANDS REP BEGAN DISCUSSION ALONG LINES EARLIER AGREED BY ALLIES, INDICATING THAT HIS REMARKS WERE BASED ON THE PREVIOUS STATEMENTS BY THE CANADIAN REP OF MAY 17 AND 21 AND WOULD ADDRESS THE SUBJECT IN THE SAME ORDER AS IT WAS ORRIGNALLY PRESENTED. HIS REMARKS WERE AS FOLLOWS:

A. GENERAL

1. FIRST, A FEW GENERAL REMARKS: THE EASTERN COUNTIRES HAVE SUGGESTED A VERY GENERAL AGENDA WHICH WE CONSIDER MORE A DESCRIPTION THAN AN AGENDA. HOWEVER, WE CONSIDER THAT A MORE DETAILED AGENDA THAN SUCH A GENERAL SUGGESTION IS REQUIRED TO SERVE AS A BASIS FOR ADEQUATE PREPARATIONS DURING THE SUMMER FOR THE MAIN CONFERENCE. THE NEGOTIATORS SHOULD ARRIVE AT THE AUTUMN SESSION WITH A CLEAR IDEA OF THE ISSUES TO BE DUSCUSSED, AND WITH POSITIONS PREPARED IN ADVANCE IN ORDER TO FACILITATE ORDERLY NEGOTIATIONS.

2. MOREOVER, OUR PUBLIC OPINION WOULD NOT UNDERSTAND IT IF, AFTER SEVERAL MONTHS HERE, WE COULD COME UP WITH NOTHING MORE THAN AN AGENDA CONSISTING ONLY OF ONE GENERAL TOPIC. IN ORDER TO PREPARE PUBLIC OPINION TO SUPPORT EFFORTS OF OUR NEGOTIATORS IN THE AUTUMN, THE PUBLIC SHOULD E MADE AWARE OF THE TYPE OF ISSUES WHICH WILL BE ADDRESSED.

B. TIMING AND STATES

1. AS REGARDS OUR FIRST POINT, TIMING AND STAGES, IT IS A FACT THAT THESE PRELIMINARY TALKS THEMSELVES HAVE BEEN CONDUCTED IN A SERIES OF STAGES, DEALING WITH ISSUES IN SEQUENCE. IT SEEMS REASONABLE TO ASSUME THAT THE CONCLUSION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF ANY POSSIBLE AGREEMENTS WOULD BE CONDUCTED IN THE SAME WAY. THE SUBJECT MATTER OF THE PENDING NEGOTIATIONS IS COMPLEX AND THEREFORE PARTICULARLY DIFFICULT. THE NEGOTIATING PROCESS WILL BE BREAKING NEW GROUND AND THUS BE A LEARNING PROCESS ALOS. WE FAIL TO UNDERSTAND, THEREFORE, WHY YOU OPPOSE A DISCUSSION OF TIMING AND STAGES, PARTICULARLY WHEN YOU ADMIT CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 VIENNA 04305 01 OF 06 231448 Z

THE POSSIBILITY THAT WE MIGHT WELL AGREE TO CONDUCT THE NEGOTIATIONS ON THIS PATTERN? COULD YOU EXPLAIN WHAT ASPECT OF THE PROPOSAL YOU FIND DIFFICULT TO ACCEPT?

2. DO YOU SERIOUSLY BELIEVE THAT WE CAN ACCOMPLISH THE OBJECTIVES OF THIS COMPLEX NEGOTIATIONS IN ONE STAGE? IF NOT, WHY DO YOU OBJECT TO INCLUDING AN AGENDA ITEM ON TIMING AND STAGES?

3. MR. KHLESTOV SUGGESTED YESTERDAY THAT IT WAS UP TO THE NEGOTIATORS TO DICIDE IF STAGES WERE NECESSARY. IF THIS IS SOMETHING THAT NEGOTIATORS MUST DICIDE, THEN IT SEEMS TO BE A LOGICLA ITEM FOR INCLUSION IN THE AGENDA FOR THE NEGOTIATIONS.

C. PRINCIPLES AND CRITERIA

1. AS REGARDS PRINCIPLES AND CRITERIA, IT IS NORMAL INGER-

NATIONAL PRACTICE AT THE
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 VIENNA 04305 02 OF 06 231429 Z

41

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-02 INR-10

L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15 USIA-12

NEA-10 GAC-01 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 OIC-04 AEC-11 AECE-00

ACDA-19 OMB-01 RSR-01 /153 W
----- 011529

P R 231238 Z MAY 73
FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8961
INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY
MBFR CAPITALS 487
USMISSION GENEVA
USNMR SHAPE
USLOSACLANT
USCINCEUR
USDOCOSOUTH
USDEL SALT TWO II

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 2 OF 6 VIENNA 4305

GENEVA FOR DISTO

FROM US REP MBFR

2. IN THIS CONTEXT YOU WOULD NOT AGREE THAT IT WOULD BE
DESIRABLE TO TRY TO REACH AGREEMENT TO REDUCE THE RISK OF
DANGEROUS MISUNDERSTANDINGS IN THIS REGION OF TROOP CONCENTRA-
TION? IF SO, WHY NOT DISCUSS MEANS OF DOING SO UNDER AN
AGENDA ITEM WHICH PROVIDES SPECIFICALLY FOR SUCH DISCUSSION?

F. FORCES TO BE ADDRESSED

1. ON FORCES TO BE ADDRESSED, THE QUESTION RAISED YESTERDAY
OF WHETHER " FORCES" INCLUDES ONLY PERSONNEL AND/ OR ARMAMENTS
IS SOMETHING TO BE ADDRESSED IN THE NEGOTIATIONS PROPER, BUT
THE FACT THAT YOU HAVE RAISED QUESTIONS ABOUT IT AGAIN DEMON-
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 04305 02 OF 06 231429 Z

STRATES THAT THE ISSUE NEEDS TO BE DISCUSSED IN THE NEGOTIATIONS
AND SHOULD WITH THE OTHER ITEMS I HAVE MENTIONED BE INCLUDED IN
AN AGENDA.

2. THE SAME ARGUMENTS SHOULD BE APPLIED TO THE QUESTION OF WHICH KIND OF FORCES THIS AGENDA ITEM APPLIES TO.

G. SIZE AND METHODS OF REDUCTION

1. ON SIZE AND METHODS OF REDUCTION, YOU HAVE SUGGESTED "REDUCTION" AS A GENERAL AGENDA ITEM. BUT, IF REDUCTION IS TO BE NEGOTIATED, THE FIRST ASPECT WHICH COMES TO MIND IS "HOW LARGE" AND "HOW." WE OUGHT TO RECOGNIZE THIS FACT BY PROVIDING A SPECIFIC AGENDA ITEM TO SERVE AS THE BASIS FOR DISCUSSION.

H. GUARANTEES OF COMPLIANCE

1. FINALLY, AS REGARDS OUR ITEM ON GUARANTEES OF COMPLIANCE, IF YOU ARE NOT OPPOSED TO DISCUSSION OF VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE, WHY SHOULD YOU OBJECT TO AN AGENDA ITEM ON THIS POINT?

4. CZECH REP SPOKE NEXT. SPEAKING FROM NOTES, HE SAID THAT SINCE IT APPEARED THAT ALL PARTICIPANTS HAD AGREED THAT IT WAS NOT THEIR TASK TO ANTICIPATE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE FORTHCOMING NEGOTIATIONS, THE EASTERN SIDE CONSIDERED IT LOGICAL THAT THIS SHOULD BE A BASIC GUIDELINE FOR THE PRESENT TASK OF SETTING UP AN AGENDA. IN THE EAST'S OPINION, PARTICIPANTS IN THE PRESENT DISCUSSION SHOULD NOT SEEK TO BE OVERLY CONCRETE NOR TO DEVOTE THEMSELVES TO DETAILS; RATHER, THEY SHOULD ATTEMPT TO SUPPLY A GENERAL FRAMEWORK WITHIN WHICH THE NEGOTIATORS COULD CARRY OUT THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES ACCORDING TO THE NEEDS DICTATED BY THE NEGOTIATIONS THEMSELVES. THIS WAS THE CONTEXT IN WHICH HE HAD SPOKEN ON THE PRECEDING DAY, WHEN HE HAD SAID IT WAS NECESSARY TO PROCEED FROM THE GENERAL TO THE CONCRETE. TO ATTEMPT TO PREDETERMINE A SPECIFIC PROCESS WAS NOT WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE PREPARATORY CONSULTATIONS. THE TASK AT HAND WAS TO CREATE A GENERAL FRAMEWORK
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 VIENNA 04305 02 OF 06 231429 Z

WHICH WOULD BE FOLLOWED BY NEGOTIATORS, WHO WOULD HAVE TO SUPPLY THE ACTUAL CONTENTS. WHY SHOULD PARTICIPANTS IN THE PREPARATORY CONSULTATIONS DETERMINE THE DETAILS OF THE THEME WHICH SUBSEQUENT NEGOTIATORS WOULD HAVE TO WORK ON? THEY SHOULD BE BEQUEATHED ONLY AN UNEQUIVOCAL THEME ALONG THE LINES OF THE EASTERN PROPOSAL. THE QUESTION AT HAND WAS THE REDUCTION OF ARMED FORCES AND ARMAMENTS IN CENTRAL EUROPE. THIS TASK SHOULD BE PASSED ON TO THE NEGOTIATORS, LEAVING THEM THEN TO DO THEIR DUTY. INDEED, IT WAS NOT INCONCEIVABLE THAT THE NEGOTIATORS WOULD SEEK TO WORK ON THE MAIN SUBJECT OF NEGOTIATIONS AT ONCE. THIS BEING THE SITUATION, WHY SHOULD PARTICIPANTS IN THE PRESENT CONSULTATIONS SEEK IN ADVANCE TO IMPOSE A SPECIFIC METHOD ON THE NEGOTIATORS? THIS WOULD IN-

FRINGE ON THE SUBSTANCE OF NEGOTIATIONS AND WAS NOT THE TASK OF THE PRESENT CONSULTATIONS.

5. POLISH REP SPOKE NEXT, NOTING THAT HE WISHED TO MAKE SOME REMARKS ON THE AGENDA ON BEHALF OF THE SOCIALIST DELEGATIONS. HIS REMARKS WERE AS FOLLOWS:

A. THE DISCUSSION ON THE AGENDA HE
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 VIENNA 04305 03 OF 06 231452 Z

41

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-02 INR-10

L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15 USIA-12

NEA-10 GAC-01 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 OIC-04 AEC-11 AECE-00

ACDA-19 OMB-01 RSR-01 /153 W
----- 011827

P R 231238 Z MAY73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8962

INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

MBFR CAPITALS 488

USMISSION GENEVA

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

USDEL SALT TWO II

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 3 OF 6 VIENNA 4305

GENEVA FOR DISTO

FROM US REP MBFR

ALSO THERE ARE REASONS FOR OUR DOUBTS AS TO WHAT ARE THE WESTERN INTENTIONS COVERED UNDER THE HEADINGS OF THEIR PROPOSED AGENDA WHICH MENTION ONLY REDUCTION OF TROOPS BUT NOT ADDRESS THEMSELVES TO THE SUBJECT OF ARMAMENTS. THESE DOUBTS MAY MULTIPLY AS WE APPROACH PROPER DRAFTING OF THE AGENDA.

ONE MAY ASSUME THAT IN THE SERACH OF THE WORDING WHICH WOULD BE NON- DETRIMENTAL TO THEIR SECUTIY INTERESTS, BOTH SIDES WILL SPEND MUCHTIME IN TRYING TO OBTAIN THE EXPLANATION OF THE MEANING OF CERTAIN TERMS AND NOTIONS WHICH ONE FINDS IN THE WESTERN STATEMENTS, THE LATEST ANSWERS TO OUR QUESTIONS INCLUDED. THIS MAY INDEED POSE A DANGER OF
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 04305 03 OF 06 231452 Z

TREPASSING OUR TERMS OF REFERENCE AND GOING INTO DISCUSSION OF ISSUES ON THEIR MERITS, WHILE THERE SEEMS TO BE THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THE DISCUSSION OF THE SUBSTANCE IS NOT, AND CANNOT BE, OUR TASK.

F. WE ARE FOR THE EXPEDIENT AND EFFECTIVE METHOD OF PREPARATION OF THE AGENDA FOR THE FORTHCOMING NEGOTIATIONS. CONSEQUENTLY, SOCIALIST COUNTRIES PROPOSE THE SOLUTION CONCERNING AN AGENDA BASED ON THE FOLLOWING PREMISES:

- THE AGENDA MUST PROVIDE A CONCISE REFLECTION OF THE DESIRE OF THE PARTIES OF THE FORTHCOMING NEGOTIATIONS TO ADDRESS THEMSELVES TO THEIR MAIN OBJECTIVE, WHICH IS THE REDUCTION OF ARMED FORCES AND ARMAMENTS;
- THE FUTURE AGENDA MUST BE SUFFICIENTLY SHORT AND GENERAL IN TERMS TO AVOID THE SURFACING NOW OF DIVERGENT OPINIONS ON MATTERS OF SUBSTANCE WHICH WILL HAVE TO BE DISCUSSED DURING THE FORTHCOMING NEGOTIATIONS.

G. SUCH A GENERAL, CONCISE OUTLINE OF AN AGENDA SHOULD, IN THE OPINION OF SOCIALIST STATES, CONTAIN THE FOLLOWING ELEMENTS:

- REDUCTION OF ARMED FORCES AND ARMAMENTS IN THE STRATEGIC AREA OF CENTRAL EUROPE WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO THE SECURITY OF ANY OF THE PARTIES;
- CREATION OF A WORKING BODY.

WE BELIEVE THAT THESE ELEMENTS SUGGEST AN OBVIOUSLY NEUTRAL APPROACH TO THE FORMULATION OF THE AGENDA. THEY FOLLOW THE EVIDENT LINES OF CONCORD ALREADY ACHIEVED IN OUR CONSULTATIONS

6. GDR REP SPOKE NEXT. REFERRING TO THE REMARKS OF THE NETHERLANDS REP ABOUT PUBLIC OPINION, HE SAID THAT PUBLIC OPINION IN THE GDR WOULD FIND IT EASIER TO UNDERSTAND THE EASTERN PROPOSAL THAN SUCH UNCLEAR ASPECTS OF THE ALLIED PROPOSALS AS PHASING AND PRINCIPLES AND CRITERIA. IT APPEARED TO HIM AND HIS EASTERN COLLEAGUES THAT THE ALLIED PROPOSALS REPRESENTED AN ATTEMPT TO DETERMINE THE COMPONENTS OF THE FORTHCOMING NEGOTIATIONS, AND THEREBY WENT INTO TOO MANY DETAILS AS WELL AS INTO SUBSTANCE. A CLOSE READING OF THE CANADIAN STATEMENTS OF MAY 21 AND MAY 17 CONFIRMED THE EARLIER IMPRESSION OF THE EAST THAT THE WESTERN PROPOSAL WAS MORE OR LESS A REPETITION OF MATERIAL FROM NATO COMMUNIQUE, ESPECIALLY THE ROME COMMUNIQUE OF 1970. THUS HE HAD CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 VIENNA 04305 03 OF 06 231452 Z

TO R
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 VIENNA 04305 04 OF 06 231451 Z

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-02 INR-10

L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15 USIA-12

NEA-10 GAC-01 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 OIC-04 AEC-11 AECE-00

ACDA-19 OMB-01 RSR-01 /153 W

----- 011817

P R 231238 Z MAY 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8963

INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

MBFR CAPITALS 489

USMISSION GENEVA

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

USDEL SALT TWO II

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 4 OF 6 VIENNA 4305

GENEVA FOR DISTO

FROM USREP MBFR

8. THE US REP SAID THE ARGUMENTS USED BY THE EAST WERE BECOMING SOMEWHAT MORE SUCCINT, AND WELL- PHRASED AS THEY WERE REITERATED, BUT THEY DID NOT APPEAR TO CONTAIN ANY NEW ELEMENTS. THE EASTERN DELEGATES WERE FAILING TO MAKE A NECESSARY INTELLECTUAL DISTINCTION; THE FACT THAT IT WAS AGREED THAT THE PRESENT TALKS SHOULD NOT SEEK TO DECIDE QUESTIONS OF SUBSTANCE DID NOT MEAN THAT ALL MENTION OF ISSUES OF SUBSTANCE WAS EXCLUDED. ANY EFFORT TO WRITE DOWN AN AGENDA REQUIRED THE MENTION OF SUBSTANCE, ALTHOUGH IT DID NOT OF COURSE IMPLY THAT THE CONTENT OF SUBSTANTIVE PROBLEMS SHOULD BE RESOLVED. THE EASTERN SIDE SHOULD RECOGNIZE THAT SOME MENTION OF SUBSTANCE WAS NECESSARY IN DEVELOPING AN AGENDA. THE GDR REP HAD COMMENTED AT THE CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 04305 04 OF 06 231451 Z

PRECEDING MEETING THAT BOTH SIDES SEEMED MORE FAMILIAR WITH EACH OTHERS CONCEPTS. THIS WAS EVEN MORE TRUE FOR THE PRESENT MEETING. THEREFORE, IT SHOULD BE POSSIBLE TO AGREE ON SOME COMMON WAY TO MENTION ISSUES OF SUBSTANCE RELEVANT TO SETTING UP AN AGENDA. THE CZECH REP HAD SAID THAT, BY THEIR PROPOSAL, THE ALLIES WERE TRYING TO MAKE ADVANCE DECISIONS FOR THE FUTURE NEGOTIATIONS. ON THE CONTRARY, THE ALLIED REPS WOULD CONSIDER IT IRRESPONSIBLE NOT TO PROVIDE THE NEGOTIATORS WITH A RATIONAL PREPARATION FOR THEIR TASK THROUGH THE DESIGNATION OF REASONABLE AGENDA HEARINGS. HOW WAS IT POSSIBLE TO PREPARE

THE NEGOTIATIONS WITHOUT SOME GENERAL LIMITED AGREEMENT ON THE TOPICS TO BE COVERED? THE SINGLE HEADING PROPOSED BY THE EAST DID NOT PERMIT SUCH PREPARATIONS. THE EASTERN POSITION WAS IN FACT CONTRADICTORY. THE EASTERN SIDE HAD PROPOSED SOMETHING WHICH WAS NOT AN AGENDA, BUT IN FACT A DESCRIPTION. AT THE SAME TIME, THE EASTERN REPS ASKED QUESTIONS WHICH INDICATED A WIDE AREA OF UNDERSTANDING THAT CERTAIN TOPICS SHOULD BE TREATED IN NEGOTIATIONS. THIS BEING THE CASE, WHY WAS IT NOT POSSIBLE TO WRITE DOWN THESE TOPICS AS PART OF THE AGENDA?

9. FOLLOWING A PAUSE DURING WHICH THE EASTERN REPS DECLINED TO MAKE FURTHER COMMENTS, THE UK REP TOOK THE FLOOR TO SAY THAT HE REGRETTED THAT HE WOULD HAVE TO REPEAT A NUMBER OF THE SAME THINGS HE HAD SAID BEFORE. THE EAST' S STATEMENTS WERE INDEED CLEAR IN A NEGATIVE SENSE. NO PROGRESS WAS APPARENT, WITH NO MOVEMENT TOWARD ANSWERING MORE CLEARLY SOME OF THE QUESTIONS POSED EARLIER BY THE ALLIED REPS. IT WOULD APPEAR THAT BOTH SIDES AGREED THAT IN THE FUTURE BOTH SIDES SHOULD BE ABLE TO INTRODUCE OTHER SUBJECTS OF INTEREST FOR DISCUSSION IN NEGOTIATIONS BEYOND THOSE IN AN AGREED AGENDA; THERE WAS, HOWEVERN NO CONFIRMATION THAT THIS VIEW WAS SHARED BY THE EAST. THERE ALSO SEEMED TO BE AGREEMENT ON THE PRINCIPLE ON UN-DIMINISHED SECURITY AND ON ITS IMPORTANCE. AT THE SAME TIME, FOR THE ALLIES, THIS WAS NOT THE ONLY PRINCIPLE AND DID NOT REPRESENT AN AGEDA ITEM. AGENDA ITEMS WERE IN FACT POINTS THAT REQUIRED FURTHER DISCUSSION, AND SHOULD NOT REASONABLY INCLUDE PRINCIPLES THAT APPEARED ALREADY AGREED.

10. UK REP SAID THAT, TO RETURN TO A POINT HE HAD MADE IN THE PRECEDING MEETING, THE EASTERN PROPOSALS WERE TOO THIN AND UNSATISFACTORY FOR AN AGENDA. EARLIER, THE EASTERN REPS HAD
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 VIENNA 04305 04 OF 06 231451 Z

MENTIONED THAT THE ALLIED PROPOSALS WERE BASED ON NATO COMMUNIQUEs INCLUDING THE ROME DECLARATION. IT WAS TRUE THAT THE ALLIES HAD FOR SOME TIME HAD A CONSISTENT PHILOSOPHY OF MBFR AND CONSIDERED THAT MBFR INCLUDED A NUMBER OF DIFFERENT ASPECTS. YET THE ALLIES HAD NOT SOUGHT TO INSERT THEIR DESIDERATA INTO THEIR AGENDA PROPOSAL, WHICH WAS NEUTRALLY FORMULATED. AS FOR THE GDR REPS REMARKS THAT THE EASTERN PROPOSAL WAS NEUTRALLY WORDED BECAUSE IT DID NOT FOLLOW THE PHRASING OF THE PRAGUE DECLARATION, IT WAS IN FACT DIFFICULT TO SEE MUCH DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE AGENDA PROPOSAL MADE BY THE POLISH REP AND RELEVANT PRORTIONS OF THE PRAGUE DECLARATION.

11. UK REP SAID THE EASTERN SIDE APPEARED TO HAVE DEVELOPED THE THEME IN CURRENT DISCUSSIONS THAT WHAT THE ALLIES DESCRIBED AS NEUTRAL IN THEIR AGENDA FORMULATION - WHICH WAS INDEED AS NEUTRAL AS THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE COULD BE - WAS NOT NEUTRAL. AT THE SAME TIME, THE EAST HAD MADE NO SUGGESTIONS ON WHAT MORE NEUTRAL WORKING MIGHT BE. THE ALLIED SIDE FOUND IT HARD TO UNDERSTAND HOW THE EAST COULD WISH TO START ON THE SUBJECT OF

AGENDA, AND THEN WISH TO RESTRICT DISCUSSION MERELY TO A FEW PLATITUDES. THE CONCEPT OF UNDIMINISHED SECURITY, FOR EXAMPLE, WOULD NOT AS AN AGENDA ITEM LEAD ANYONE TOWARD REACHING A POSSIBLE AGREEMENT ON SUBSTANCE, AND WAS NOT IN THE SAME CATEGORY AS AN AGENDA ITEM WHICH NEEDED TO BE NEGOTIATED IN THE SUBSTANTIVE NEGOTIATIONS. THE COMMENTS MADE IN THE PRESENT MEETING BY THE POLISH REP APPEARED TO BE A REFORMULATION OF AN EARLIER EASTERN VIEW. A NEW WORD, " STRATEGIC", HAD HOWEVER BEEN INTRODUCED WITHOUT EXPLANATION. THIS SEEMED UNNECESSARY, SINCE THE WHOLE SUBJECT MATTER OF THE FORTHCOMING NEGOTIATIONS WAS IN FACT A HEAVILY STRATEGIC ONE.

12. THE UK REP STATED THAT, SINCE THE REMARKS OF THE POLISH REP WERE ESSENTIALLY A RECAPITULATION OF HIS PREVIOUS STATEMENT, HE ASSUMED THAT HIS QUESTION OF THE PREVIOUS DAY ON WHETHER THE EASTERN AGENDA PROPOSAL OF MAY 17 WAS INTENDED AS A COMPREHENSIVE PROPOSAL OR NOT SHOULD IN FACT BE ANSWERED IN THE AFFIRMATIVE, I. E., THAT THE EAST DID ENVISAGE ITS PROPOSAL AS A COMPREHENSIVE ONE, NOT SUBJECT TO EXPANSION.

13. THE CZECH REP, READING FROM NOTES, SAID THAT THE AGENDA APPROACH OF THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES STEMMED FROM A FOCUS ON
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 VIENNA 04305 04 OF 06 231451 Z

THE MAIN TOPIC OF THE NEGOTIATIONS, THE REDUCTION OF ARMED FORCES AND ARMAMENTS IN CENTRAL EUROPE. THE EAST HAD ASSUMED THAT THIS APPRECIATION WAS ALSO SHARED BY THE WEST. IN HIS STATEMENT OF MAY 21, THE CANADIAN REP HAD STATED THAT ONE OF THE GENERAL OBJECTIVES OF THE NEGOTIATIONS, AS PERCEIVED BY THE ALLIES, WAS " REDUCTION OF FORCES IN CENTRAL EUROPE WITHOUT DETRIMENT TO THE SECURITY OF ANY PARTY." IN THE EASTERN VIEW, PREPARATIONS FOR NEGOTIATIONS SHOULD FOCUS ON THE MAIN ISSUE AND NOT DEFLECT ATTENTION TO DETAILS.

CONFIDENTIAL
NMAFVVZCZADP000

PAGE 01 VIENNA 04305 05 OF 06 231535 Z

46
ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-02 INR-10

L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15 USIA-12

NEA-10 GAC-01 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 OIC-04 AEC-11 AECE-00

ACDA-19 OMB-01 RSR-01 /153 W
----- 012132

P R 231238 Z MAY 73
FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8964
INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY
ALL MBFR CAPITALS 490
USMISSION GENEVA
USNMR SHAPE
USLOSACLANT
USCINCEUR
USDOCOSOUTH
USDEL SALT TWO II

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 5 OF 6 VIENNA 4305

GENEVA FOR DISTO

FROM US REP MBFR

14. THE CZECH REP RECALLED THE 1958 SURPRISE ATTACK CONFERENCE, NOTING THAT ONE REASON THIS CONFERENCE DID NOT SUCCEED WAS ITS EFFORT TO WORK OUT ABSTRACT PRINCIPLES. THIS OF COURSE DID NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT A PRECEDENT FOR THE FORTHCOMING NEGOTIATIONS, SINCE SUCCESS WAS A FUNCTION OF MANY THINGS, INCLUDING GOODWILL. YET THE AGENDA PROPOSAL OF THE ALLIES DID SERVE TO COMPLICATE THE QUESTION OF REDUCTION OF ARMED FORCES AND ARMAMENT, AND WOULD ONLY SERVE TO DELAY SUCCESSFUL RESULTS IN THE NEGOTIATIONS AND TO DELAY A REDUCTION OF MILITARY CONFRONTATION IN CENTRAL EUROPE. THE CANADIAN REP' S REMARKS OF MAY 21 ABOUT ARRANGEMENTS TO ENHANCE STABILITY SEEMED TO BE IMPOSING A PRIOR SEQUENCE OF EVENTS ON THE FORTHCOMING
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 04305 05 OF 06 231535 Z

NEGOTIATIONS, I. E., THAT SUCH MEASURES SHOULD FACILITATE FUTURE NEGOTIATIONS AND THUS BY IMPLICATION SHOULD PRECEED THE REDUCTION OF ARMED FORCES AND ARMAMENTS IN CENTRAL EUROPE. THE EASTERN SIDE COULD NOT AGREE WITH SUCH AN IDEA.

15. A FURTHER TROUBLESOME ASPECT OF THE ALLIED PROPOSAL, CONTINUED THE CZECH REP, WAS THE ITEM ON " GEOGRAPHIC ASPECTS." THE EASTERN SIDE WAS SURPOSED THAT THE WESTERN DELEGATIONS THOUGHT THAT THIS SUBJECT STILL NEEDED TO BE DIFINED. IF THIS WERE THE CASE WHAT KIND OF EVALUATION COULD ONE PUT ON THE WORK OF THE PRECEDING THREE MONTHS IN VIENNA, AND WHAT WAS THE STATUS OF THE PARTICIPATION AGREEMENT? THE PROCEDURES AND PARTICIPATION DOCUMENT WAS A BINDING ONE FOR NEGOTIATIONS, AND THE EAST EXPECTED ALL PARTIES TO RESPECT IT. IN PARAGRAPH TWO OF THIS DOCUMENT THE PARTICIPANTS WERE NOTED AND THE AREA WAS DESIGNATED. AS FOR THE ALLIED REFERENCE TO " GEOGRAPHIC ASPECTS," THIS WAS CLEARLY NOT A CASE OF MERELY DIFING TERRITORY, AS BY SQUARE KILOMETERS, BUT A QUESTION OF NATIONAL AND FOREIGN FORCES WHICH SOULD BE ADDRESSED IN STRATEGIC TERMS, RESPECTING THE PRINCIPLE OF EQUAL SECURITY, WHICH WAS THE PRINCIPLE USED IN DETERMINING PARTICIPATION, AND THEREFORE APPLIED TO AREAS. THE CZECH REP NOTED THAT THE CANADIAN REP HAD SAID THAT

NTEOTIATIONS WOULD FOCUS ON CENTRAL EUROPE; TODAY THE POLISH REP WAS EQUALLY CLEAR ON THE SUBJECT.

16. THE FRG REP SAID HE WISHED TO COMMENT ON SOME OF THE POINTS JUST MADE BY EASTERN REPS. THE POLISH REP HAD CALLED THE WESTERN AGENDA PROPOSAL " MAXIMALISTIC". BUT IN FACT, AN OVERSIMPLIFIED " MIMINALISTIC" PROPOSAL WAS A MAXIMALISTIC ONE AS IT ONLY REFLECTED THE VIEWPOINT OF ONE SIDE. FURTHER, THE EASTERN SIDE HAD EXPRESSED DOUBTS ABOUT ALLIES INTENTIONS. IN FACT, THE ALLIES HAD LAUNCHED THE IDEA OF AN MBFR CONFERENCE AND WERE NOT THE SIDE THAT WOULD CAUSE DELAY. DELAY COULD EASILY BE CREATED BY INSISTING ON AN OVERLY SHORT AND SIMPLIFIED AGENDA. THE FRG REP SAID THAT, LIDE THE US REP, HE WOULD LIKE TO CAUTION AGAINST CONFUSING THE SIMPLE LISTING OF SUBSTANTIVE QUESTIONS WITH THE PROCESS OF GOING INTO SUBSTANCE.

17 THE FRG REP RECALLED THAT THE CZECH REP HAD EARLIER QUESTIONED THE COMPETENCE OF THE PRESENT PARTICIPANTS TO DEVELOP AN AGENDA DURING THE PRESENT CONSULTATIONS, SAYING THAT THIS
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 VIENNA 04305 05 OF 06 231535 Z

WOULD PREJUDGE NEGOTIATIONS. IF THE NEGOTIATORS WOULD BE THROWN OFF BY A RESONALBE AGENDA DEVELOPED IN CONSULTATIONS, WOULD THEY BE ANY MORE COMPETENT TO JUDGE THE VALUE OF AN AGENDA CONSISTING OF A SINGLE POINT? THE ALLIES HAD NOT, AS SUGGESTED BY THE CZECH REP, TRIED TO AMASS THE MAXIMUM NUMBER OF AGENDA ITEMS: IN FACT, THE HAD SIMPLY TRIED TO DO THEIR JOB PROPERLY. AS A POINT OF DETAIL, THE GDR REP HAD REFERRED CRITICALLY TO THE MC CLOY- ZORIN AGREEMENT OF 1961. IN FACT, HOWEVER, THIS AGREEMENT WAS MADE IN A WORLD- WIDE FRAME OF REFERENCE REFERRING TO GENERAL ANC COMPLETE DISARMEMANT AND EXPRESSED THE VIEW THAT GCD COULD NOT BE APPROACHED IN ONE STEP BUT RATHER IN A NUMBER OF STEPS. FRG REP SAID THE CZECH REP HAD CITED THE PROCEDURES AND PARTICIPATION- ARRANGEMENT OF MAY 14, SAYING THAT THIS DOCUMENT SPELLED OUT WHO WOULD BE THE PARTIES TO FUTURE AGREEMENTS. IN FACT, THE AGREEMENT REFERRED TO " POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS IN POSSIBLE AGREEMENTS", WHICH WAS A DIFFERENT CONCEPT.

18. FOLLOWING A FURTHER PAUSE, THE POLISH REP MADE A STATEMENT FOR THE EASTERN SIDE. HE SIAD THAT IT WAS CLEAR THAT THERE WAS A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE APPROACHES OF BOTH SIDES TO THE QUESTION OF AGENDA. THE EAST COULD NOT AGREE, HOWEVER, THE THE ALLIED APPROACH WAS A MRE CORRECT APPROACH THAN THAT OF THE EAST. IT WAS CLEAR TO THE EAST THAT THE ALLIED PROPOSAL REFLECTED NATO THINKING AS, FOR EXAMPLE, EXPRESSED IN NATO COMMUNIQES. THUS, IT WAS " AN MBFR APPROACH". THE EASTERN APPROACH WAS DIFFERENT. IN FACT, IT WAS THE MORE CONSTRUCTIVE APPROACH OF THE TWO, AS THE EAST HAD SOUGHT TO EXPLAIN THROUGH OBJECTIVE REASONING - AND WITHOUT REFERENCE TO SUBJECTIVE INTERESTS OF ONLY ONE SIDE. IT WAS THE MORE MEUTRAL APPROACH, AND COULD MORE EASILY LEAD TO RESULTS THAN THE ALLIED APPROACH. POLISH REP THEN ASKED WHAT SHOULD BE DONE NEXT. IT APPEARED THAT BOTH

SIDES HAD EXPLAINED THEIR POSITIONS, WITH THE ALLIED SIDE MAINTAINING ITS EARLIER POSITION AND WITH THE EAST SEEING NO REASON TO CHANGE THEIRS. UNDER CIRCUMSTANCES LIKE THESE, WHAT THEN WOULD BE A CONSTRUCTIVE WAY TO PROCEED, AND TO FORM AN AGENDA ON WHICH BOTH SIDES COULD AGREE? THE US REP ASKED IF THE POLISH REP HAD ANY SUGGESTION ON THIS SUBJECT. THE POLISH REP REPLIED THAT PERHAPS THE ALLIES COULD EXAMINE THE EASTERN PROPOSAL ONCE MORE IN AN EFFORT TO FIND CONSTRUCTIVE ELEMENTS IN IT.

CONFIDENTIAL
NMAFVVZCZADP000

PAGE 01 VIENNA 04305 06 OF 06 231605 Z

43
ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-02 INR-10

L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15 USIA-12

NEA-10 GAC-01 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 OIC-04 AEC-11 AECE-00

ACDA-19 OMB-01 RSR-01 /153 W
----- 012492

P R 231238 Z MAY 73
FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8965
INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY
MBFR CAPITALS 491
USMISSION GENEVA
USNMR SHAPE
USLOSACLANT
USCINCEUR
USDOCUSOUTH
USDEL SALT TWO II

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 6 OF 6 VIENNA 4305

GENEVA FOR DISTO

FROM US REP MBFR

19. THE FRG REP THEN MADE A STATEMENT OF SUMMARY OBSERVATIONS FOR THE ALLIED SIDE. HIS REMARKS WERE AS FOLLOWS:

A. MR. STRULAK HAS JUST CHARACTERIZED YOUR APPROACH AS A NEUTRAL AND GENERALLY- WORDED ONE, AND OURS AS A DETAILED ONE. WE WOULD CHARACTERIZE THIS DIFFERENCE IN ANOTHER MANNER. WE CONSIDER THAT YOUR APPROACH TO AGENDA IS INCOMPLETE AND THAT OUR APPROACH IN RESPONSE TO OBJECTIVE NEEDS IS A MORE COMPREHENSIVE ONE. YOU WISH TO COVER ONLY A FEW ASPECTS OF THE SUBJECT MATER. WE WISH TO COVER ALL MAJOR ASPECTS AS THEY CAN NOW

BE SEEN, WHILE NOT RULING OUT THAT OTHER ASPECTS MAY EMERGE
DURING THE NETOTIATIONS.
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 04305 06 OF 06 231605 Z

B. IT IS NOT AT ALL OUR WISH TO COMPLICATE OUR JOINING
TASK HERE OF PREPARING FOR THE NEGOTIATIONS. QUITE TO THE
CONTRARY, BY PROPOSING A RELATIVELY COMPLETE AGENDA WHICH
COVERS THE MAJOR ASPECTS OF THE SUBJECT MATTER, WE BELIEVE WE
ARE PUTTING FORWARD AN APPROACH WHICH WOULD BE GENUINELY
HELPFUL BOTH IN THE PREPARATIONS FOR THE NEGOTIATIONS WHICH
BOTH SIDES WILL HAVE TO UNDERTAKE AND HELPFUL TO THE NEGOTIATORS
THEMSELVES, THROUGH FACILITATING THEIR TASK ORF ORGANIZING IN THE
MOST EFFICIENT WAY THE DIFFICULT SUBJECT MATTER WITH WHICH
THEY WILL HAVE TO DEAL. IN PROPOSING AN INCOMPLETE AGENDA, YOU
WOULD, WE BELIEVE, BE COMPLICATING THE TASK OF THE NEGOTIATORS,
WHO WOULD BE GIVEN VERY LITTLE TO GO ON WERE WE TO ACCEPT YOUR
APPROACH.

C. WE WOULD EMPHATICALLY DENY ASSERTIONS BY EASTERN PARTICI-
PANTS THAT THE INCLUSION OF A NEUTRALLY- WORDED ITEM ON AN AGENDA
WOULD IN ANY WAY IMPLY THE RESOLUTION IN ONE SENSE OR ANOTHER OF
A SUBSTANTIVE ISSUE. FOR EXAMPLE, AS REGARDS STAGES OR PHASES,
MR. KHLESTOV SAID YESTERDAY THAT NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE
AT THIS POINT ON WHETHER NEGOTIATIONS AND/ OR IMPLEMENTATION OF
AGREEMENTS REACHED IN NEGOTIATIONS SHOULD BE PHASED. WE ARE NOT
ASKING YOUR NOW TO AGREE TO THIS QUESTION IN THE FORM OF OUR
SUGGESTED AGENDA ITEM. HOWEVER, AS YOUR YOURSELVES HAVE
MADE CLEAR, THE ISSUE IN AN OPEN ONE. WE BELIEVE IT IS IMPORTANT
THAT IT BE ADDRESSED IN THE NEGOTIATIONS. THEREFORE, AGREEING
TO AN AGENDA ITEM ON PHASING DOES NOT IMPLY THAT YOU AGREE THAT
NEGOTIATIONS OR AGREEMENTS MUST BE PHASED, BUT SIMPLY THAT THE
QUESTION OF WHETHER THEY SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT BE WILL BE ADDRESSED
IN THE NEGOTIATIONS.

D. AS MR. STRULAK HAS STATED, OUR DISCUSSION YESTERDAY
AND TODAY HAS SHOWN THAT WE HAVE DIFFERING CONCEPTS OF WHAT AN
AGENDA IS; THAT IS, WHAT THE FUNCITION OF AN AGENDA SHOULD BE.
WE OURSELVES DO NOT BELIEVE THAT BY ANY NORMAL DEFINITION AN
AGENDA SHOULD BE MERELY A DESCRIPTION OF THE GOALS OF OUR JOINT
PROJECT. TO THE CONTRARY, WE CONSIDER THAT AN AGENDA SHOULD BE
A TOOL, A MEANS TOWARD THE EFFICIENT ORGANIZATION OF THE WORK
OF THE PENDING NEGOTIATIONS. AS AGENDA SHOULD THEREFORE COVER
THE MAIN ASPECTS NEGOTIATIONS. AN AGENDA SHOULD THEREFORE COVER
THE MAIN ASPECTS OF THE SUBECT WHICH THE NEGOTIATORS WILL HAVE
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 VIENNA 04305 06 OF 06 231605 Z

TO ADDRESS.

E. WHERE -- AS IS PRESENTLY THE CASE -- WE HAVE NOT REALLY
EXPLORED EACH OTHER' S VIEW ON SUBSTANCE, OR WHERE THESE VIEWS

MAY DIFFER, IT IS NECESSARY TO DRAW UP AN AGENDA IN NEUTRAL TERMS; THAT IS, IN TERMS WHICH DO NOT FAVOR THE VIEWS OF ONE SIDE OR THE OTHER AND WHICH DO NOT FORESHADOW OR PREJUDICE THE DECISIONS ON ASPECTS OF THE SUBJECT MATTER WHICH NETOIATORS MAY TAKE. WE HAVE TAKEN GREAT PAINS IN DEVELOPING OUR AGENDA PROPOSALS TO DO JUST THIS: TO COVER THE MAJOR ASPECTS OF THE SUBJECT MATTER, AS WE SEE THEM, IN A NEUTRAL WAY, WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO EITHER SIDE AND WITHOUT RESOLVING QUESTIONS OF SUBSTANCE WHICH WE ALL AGREE MUST BE LEFT TO THE NEGOTIATIONS.

F. WE REGRET THAT THESE REASONABLE PROPOSALS DO NOT APPEAR TO HAVE FOUND YOUR AGREEMENT. IN SUMMING UP THE PRESENT SITUATION I WOULD SAY THAT YOU APPARENTLY HAVE FIRM INSTRUCTIONS TO GAIN AGREEMENT TO YOUR AGENDA SUGGESTION IN ITS PRESENT FORM. WE FOR OUR PART HAVE INSTRUCTIONS TO GAIN AGREEMENT ON OUR AGENDA PROPOSALS. ON THE BASIS OF THE DISCUSSION THUS FAR, I WOULD RELUCTANTLY CONCLUDE THAT WE ARE UNLIKELY TO REACH AGREEMENT HERE IN VIENNA ON A MUTUALLY SATISFACTORY AGENDA. WE DO NOT SEE IN MR. STRULAK'S PROPOSAL ANY NEW ELEMENTS, AND THUS NO BASIS FOR COMING TO AN AGREED AGENDA. THERE IS IN FACT AN IMPASSE. UNDER THESE CIRCUMSTANCES, AS MR. STRULAK HAS SUGGESTED, WE SHOULD PERHAPS SEEK OTHER WAYS OF MOVING AHEAD.

20. SUBJECT TO LATER CONFIRMATION, THE TIME FOR THE NEXT SESSION WAS TENTATIVELY SET FOR 10:30 ON MAY 23, AFTER THE ALLIED REPS HAD PROPOSED AN AFTERNOON SESSION AND EASTERN REPS HAD SAID THAT A MORNING SESSION WOULD BE MORE CONVENIENT.
HUMES

CONFIDENTIAL

NMAFVVZCZ

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 10 MAY 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 23 MAY 1973
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973VIENNA04305
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19730560/abqcelme.tel
Line Count: 732
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ACTION MBFR
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 14
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 29 AUG 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <29-Aug-2001 by freemaal>; APPROVED <29-Oct-2001 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: <DBA CORRECTED> gwr 980226
Subject: MBFR: MAY 22 MEETING OF UNOFFICIAL EAST/ WEST DRAFTING PANEL
TAGS: PARM, AU
To: STATE INFO SECDEF
ALL MBFR CAPITALS
GENEVA
USNMR SHAPE
USLOSACLANT
USCINCEUR
USDOCOSOUTH

SALT TWO II

Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005